

North Carolina  
National Register Advisory Committee  
Minutes  
June 14, 2012

The North Carolina National Register Advisory Committee (NRAC) met on June 14, 2012, in the conference room on the third floor of the Archives and History/State Library Building, 109 East Jones Street, in downtown Raleigh. Committee members in attendance were: Mr. B. Perry Morrison Jr., chairman, Mrs. Millie Barbee, Mr. David R. Black, Dr. Edmond A. Boudreaux, Dr. Jerry C. Cashion, Ms. Wendy Grady, Dr. Valerie Johnson, Mr. John Larson, Ms. Jo Ramsay Leimenstoll, Dr. Linda F. Stine, and Mrs. Barbara B. Snowden. Committee member Mr. Glenn Perkins was absent.

State Historic Preservation Office (HPO) staff members present were: Jeffrey J. Crow, state historic preservation officer; Ramona Bartos, deputy state historic preservation officer; Ann Swallow, National Register coordinator; Jannette Coleridge-Taylor, National Register assistant; Chandra Burch, file and photography clerk; Anna Grantham, assistant file and photography clerk; Scott Power, Eastern Office supervisor; Mitch Wilds, Restoration Services Branch supervisor; Tim Simmons, restoration architect; Paul Fomberg, senior restoration specialist; Justin Kockritz, environmental review specialist; GIS specialists Andy Edmonds and Sam Franklin; and intern Maggie Johnson.

Visitors in attendance included Linda Carlisle, secretary of the Department of Cultural Resources; Dr. David Brook, director of the Division of Historical Resources; Office of State Archaeology (OSA) staff Steve Claggett, state archaeologist, Dolores Hall, deputy state archaeologist, Lawrence Abbott, National Register coordinator, and Ann Evans, student intern; Andrew LaRowe, chief operations officer, Guilford County Schools; consultant Cynthia de Miranda; Emmy Albritton; and Connie Johnson.

Mr. Morrison called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2012, meeting. Mrs. Barbee moved for approval, Ms. Leimenstoll seconded the motion, and all voted for it.

Mr. Morrison recognized Secretary Carlisle, who welcomed the committee and thanked the staff for their work. She then expressed her gratitude for Dr. Crow's many contributions to the Department of Cultural Resources and said that he will be greatly missed following his retirement on September 1, 2012.

Mr. Morrison recognized Ann Swallow, who presented Dr. Crow with a framed photograph of the Asheville Municipal Golf Course (designed by Donald Ross and listed in the National Register in 2005) on behalf of the National Register staff in gratitude for his professional contributions to North Carolina's National Register program as state historic preservation officer since 1995. Dr. Crow expressed his appreciation to both the HPO and OSA staffs as well as the NRAC.

Mr. Morrison reviewed the committee's conflict of interest policy before asking Dr. Crow for his report. Dr. Crow began with the positive news that the 2012-2013 state budget does not contain serious cuts in the HPO and OSA budgets and that the General Assembly has forwarded a bill

extending the historic preservation tax credits to January 1, 2015, to the Governor for her signature.

Dr. Crow then reported on his trip to Wilmington in May, Historic Preservation Month, to attend the meeting of the Historic Wilmington Foundation at which the organization announced its annual list of the region's most endangered historic resources. In anticipation of the event and at the request of Janet Seapker, he wrote an essay for the Wilmington *Star-News* on his view of historic preservation in North Carolina. Dr. Crow also reported on his visit to Brunswick Town, in conjunction to his trip to Wilmington, where he observed the extensive erosion that has exposed eighteenth-century wharves and is undermining Civil War batteries at the nearby site of Fort Anderson. He explained that a Department of Cultural Resources team comprising staff in the HPO, OSA, and State Historic Sites is working on implementation of a short-term preservation plan and that long-term solutions are being negotiated with the Army Corps of Engineers, which issues the permits for deepening the channel in order to accommodate the large ships that appear to be accelerating the erosion.

Dr. Crow concluded his report with praise for Ramona Bartos, describing her as one of his legacies and noting that he has submitted the paperwork to change her status from a probationary to a permanent employee. He also announced that Ms. Bartos is working with Elizabeth Johnson, her counterpart in South Carolina, on plans for a meeting of the southeastern state historic preservation officers to be held in Asheville in August.

Mr. Morrison asked for a report from Ms. Bartos, who began by commenting on the bill passed by the General Assembly to extend the historic preservation tax credits for one year and then reported on the bill sponsored by U. S. Senator Burr, Senate Bill 2209, to provide estate tax relief for approximately 150 National Historic Landmarks (NHL), including Biltmore. She explained that properties eligible for the tax relief outlined in the bill must be a privately owned NHL for at least twenty-five years, have been open to the public for at least twenty-five years, and remain open to the public following the death of the owner.

Ms. Bartos also reported on the HPO's expanded outreach effort prompted in part by comments made by congressional staffers during the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers' lobby day last March. She explained that these efforts include illustrated sheets announcing new listings in the National Register of Historic Places that are sent by email to Congressmen and U. S. Senators as well as local officials; the HPO's monthly E-newsletter; and the HPO's Facebook page, which was viewed by more than one thousand people during a single week in May. She added that she has been attending regional preservation summits and that the HPO is developing a statewide historic preservation plan for the five-year period 2013 through 2017. Ms. Bartos also commented on plans for the upcoming southeastern state historic preservation officers' meeting in August. She concluded by introducing intern Maggie Johnson, who recently earned a graduate degree from the UNC-Greensboro historic preservation program and is volunteering in the Raleigh office of the HPO.

Consideration of National Register nominations began with Ann Swallow's presentation of nine individual properties and districts in the central and southeastern regions of the state (see attached agenda). At the conclusion of her presentation, she recognized Andrew LaRowe, chief operations officer for Guilford County Schools. Mr. LaRowe thanked the committee for postponing their review of the nomination for the Allen Jay School Rock Gymnasium from February 2012 in order

to give the Guilford County Board of Education time to be informed about the National Register program. He said that the Allen Jay School gymnasium was excluded from a recent school construction bond issue and currently is not in use, but the board of education is seeking additional funds to rehabilitate the building. Regarding the Summerfield School gymnasium, Mr. LaRowe reported that it is used daily and that the adjoining new school was designed to be compatible with the historic building by mimicking its roofline and window details. He concluded by stating that the Guilford County Board of Education fully supports the nominations for the two gymnasiums. David Black recommended that the board of education work with an engineering firm knowledgeable about historic buildings to address the Allen Jay School gymnasium's structural problems.

Mr. Morrison asked for a motion regarding the nominations from the central and southeastern regions. Mrs. Barbee made a motion to approve the nine nominations, Dr. Cashion seconded the motion, and all voted for it.

Scott Power presented two nominations for properties in the eastern region (see attached agenda). After he concluded, Ms. Leimenstoll asked Mr. Power to show an image of the end of the pews in Bethesda Methodist Protestant Church in Halifax County. After looking at the image, she said that she believes the pews date to the mid-nineteenth century and could be associated with Thomas Day and that she would study them further. Regarding the Dupree-Moore Farm, Dr. Crow inquired about the date of the chimneys. Mr. Power replied that the stacks have been rebuilt but that the chimneys from the stacks date to ca. 1848. Upon a motion by Ms. Leimenstoll, seconded by Dr. Johnson, the two nominations were approved unanimously.

Annie McDonald presented two nominations for properties in the western region (see attached agenda). Regarding the Bostic Charge Parsonage, Mr. Black noted that the brickwork is rowlock bond, popular in the early 1900s, rather than Flemish bond as described in the nomination. He explained that rowlock bond is similar to Flemish bond but creates a cavity in the bond. Mrs. Barbee inquired about plans for the Capitola Manufacturing Company Cotton Yarn Mill. Ms. McDonald replied that the current owners want to rehabilitate it using tax credits, whereupon Mr. Morrison reminded the committee that rehabilitation plans should not be considered in making their decision about eligibility. Ms. Grady moved for approval of the two nominations, Mrs. Barbee seconded the motion, and all voted for it.

Consideration of Study List applications began with Ms. Swallow's presentation of six applications for properties in the central and southeastern regions of the state (see attached agenda). In the course of her presentation, she noted that staff recommended placement of all of the properties on the Study List with the exception of the Mount Vernon Presbyterian Church Cemetery in Rowan County because it does not meet the special criteria for significance required for cemeteries and it has lost integrity. Ms. Swallow added that staff fully supports the church's effort to raise awareness of its early history.

When Ms. Swallow concluded, Mr. Morrison asked for questions and comments. Regarding the Barker House in Vance County, Ms. Leimenstoll stated that students in the historic preservation program at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro stripped the interior of wallpaper during their recent field school. Mr. Morrison observed that the Lincolnton Rosenwald School is not a typical Rosenwald school design. Dr. Crow asked Ms. Bartos to talk about recent trips she had made to Orton Plantation with Dr. Crow and others. Ms. Bartos reported that Orton was

established by Roger Moore, one of the earliest settlers of the lower Cape Fear region, and that Orton's new owner, Louis Moore Bacon, who is a direct descendant of Roger Moore, wants to return the property to seed rice production, an undertaking for which the HPO has reviewed the required Army Corps of Engineers permits. She added that Mr. Bacon is dedicated to conservation of the approximately 8,000 acres of longleaf pine forest that he acquired with the residential compound and rice fields. Dr. Johnson stated that rice cultivation was important to African American culture and that the lower Cape Fear region is part of the Gullah-Geechee Corridor. Dr. Crow noted that there is considerable documentation of African American agriculture in the region. Ms. Bartos added that Mr. Bacon is having a cultural resource management plan prepared for Orton that includes archaeological work and restoration of the designed landscape and Ms. Swallow noted that Orton has a large slave cemetery. Ms. Leimenstoll made a motion to approve staff recommendations regarding Study List applications for central and southeastern properties, Dr. Johnson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Following a recess for lunch, the committee reconvened and Mr. Morrison asked Mr. Power to present the Study List application for the Winterville Railroad Depot in Pitt County. At the conclusion of the presentation, Mrs. Barbee moved approval for placement of the depot on the Study List, Dr. Cashion seconded the motion, and all voted for it.

Ms. McDonald presented five Study List applications for properties in the western region (see attached agenda). During her presentation, she explained that staff recommended placement of all of the properties on the Study List except for the Appalachian Cinema in Boone due to its extensive alterations. Regarding the Dunavant Cotton Manufacturing Company, Ms. McDonald gave a lengthy explanation of the factory's historic development and changes made to the property by developers since June 2011 when it was first presented to the NRAC, which declined to place it on the Study List due to 1960s additions that obscured the historic fabric. Ms. Swallow interjected with additional information about the recent removal of some of the 1960s additions and clarification that a positive recommendation by staff was not unanimous. She said that some staff members recommended placement of the property on the Study List with the provision that a successful nomination is unlikely unless a 1963 addition connecting the historic factory to a very large 1966 phase of construction is removed.

A discussion of the Dunavant Cotton Manufacturing Company ensued. Mr. Morrison questioned the age of the roof structure incorporating scarf joints that permit a great expanse of space in the original, late nineteenth-century portion of the factory to be unobstructed by vertical members. Ms. Swallow replied that staff has never seen this type of construction in a nineteenth-century building; consequently more research is necessary before a recommendation can be made for potential eligibility under Criterion C for architecture in addition to Criterion A for industry. Mr. Larson observed that removal of the 1963 addition would result in the owner's inability to use tax credits for renovation of the 1966 construction because it would then be freestanding. He asked if delaying the nomination for a year would mitigate the negative effect of the 1963 addition on consideration of the property as an enormous single building incorporating the 1960s addition as well as the 1924 warehouse. Ms. McDonald said that the recommended period of significance for the property is 1889 to 1949 when it was in use as a cotton mill. Restoration Services Branch supervisor Mitch Wilds confirmed that tax credits could not be taken for rehabilitation of the 1966 structure if it is freestanding. Ms. Swallow cautioned that development plans using tax credits should not be considered in the committee's deliberations.

Ms. McDonald completed her presentation of Study List applications for properties in the western region. When she finished, Mr. Morrison asked for a motion regarding all of the properties except for the Dunavant Cotton Manufacturing Company. Upon a motion made by Dr. Johnson and seconded by Ms. Leimenstoll, the committee unanimously approved placement of the remaining four western properties on the Study List.

Discussion of Dunavant Cotton Manufacturing Company resumed. Mr. Black observed that the property is in a very prominent location in Morganton. Mr. Morrison asked if the trusses with scarf joints in the original section of the mill are unique, to which Mr. Black replied that they are essentially bowstring trusses, which have been in use for a long time. He said that they were rarely used in mill construction for a variety of reasons, including the fact that they weren't as fire-resistant as a structural system using a lot of heavy columns and it wasn't until fire sprinkler systems began to be used in the early twentieth century that the need for slow-burn construction diminished and use of bowstring trusses became common. Mr. Black added that the truss system in the mill looks legitimate. Mrs. Barbee said that the property is very important to the integrity of its area in Morganton.

Mr. Morrison asked Ms. Swallow if staff concerns were focused on the 1960s additions. She replied that staff has learned a lesson from advising the property owners, in response to their request for an opinion about demolishing certain 1960s additions; in contrast to other situations in which staff advised that removal of comparatively small modern additions would enhance potential eligibility, in the Dunavant case the additions are quite large and trying to manage the developers' various demolition schemes is too difficult. She emphasized that when a Study List application for the property was considered in 2011, none of the additions were historic, but now in 2012 a couple of them would have crossed the fifty-year threshold and in 2013 another addition would be fifty years old. Because exceptional significance cannot be argued for the 1960s construction, staff believed that removal of the additions to reveal the mill's late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sections was a way to bring back its integrity, but the developer's selective removal of additions has left an enormous mid-1960s section attached to the historic mill. Ms. Swallow noted that it is not known if the integrity of the mill will improve with its redevelopment and that placement on the Study List is not a guarantee of National Register eligibility. She added that several staff remained concerned about the large mid-1960s wing, whereas she and Ms. McDonald took a more positive approach in the belief that staff could work with the developers and urge them to disconnect the wing.

Mr. Black asked if the remaining 1960s additions would contribute to the property's significance if a nomination were postponed to 2016, to which Ms. Swallow replied that there is no rule that something becomes significant when it reaches fifty years of age, plus the recent removal of some of the early 1960s additions has created something that never existing historically and thus could not be important for its 1960s development.

Mrs. Snowden asked about the chances that a denial of the Study List application due to the attachment of the mid-1960s wing to the historic mill would prompt the owners to detach the wing and return with yet another Study List application. Ms. McDonald replied that she does not know what the owners would do, although it appears that they wish to use the tax credits. Mr. Black stated that the owners seem to have three options: tear down everything; tear down the remaining 1960s sections; or leave it as it is now and do a project that does not involve the credits. Ms. McDonald said that the owner has done other large-scale, mixed-use rehabilitation projects but

does not know if they have used the historic rehabilitation tax credits. Mrs. Snowden observed that the owners have made a sizable investment. Ms. Grady reiterated an earlier observation that placement of the property on the Study List does not guarantee that it is going to be listed in the National Register. Mr. Black said that the committee should reject the application.

Mr. Larson noted that the property is being proposed under Criteria A and C and if only the late nineteenth-century sections were standing, there would be no doubt about eligibility, but as an ensemble, with all of the twentieth-century additions, the property was very important to the economic development of Morganton beyond 1949. He added that a decision seems to hinge on the lack of separation between the early and later sections and that further demolition could destroy the project's economic viability. Mrs. Snowden said that it is not the committee's job to make the project economically viable. Mr. Black added that if all of the 1960s additions had been left in place, at some point an argument could be made for the eligibility of the entire complex, but now that is not likely. He said that he suspects that the 1966 wing is a white elephant economically and the property's marketability would be improved if it were replaced with freestanding new construction. Mr. Morrison cautioned that the economics of the project is not the committee's concern and that the focus should remain on the property's integrity.

Mr. Morrison asked Mrs. Barbee if there is another nineteenth-century mill in the Morganton area. Mrs. Barbee said that there are several nineteenth-century mills, but the Dunavant mill's adaptation as a furniture manufacturing facility was very important to Morganton's economic development and that its location close to the railroad tracks necessitated that the additions be built on the highly visible street side of the mill in the 1960s, when transport of goods was by trucks. Dr. Stine asked if the 1920s cotton warehouse is unusual. Ms. McDonald replied that it is interesting due to its roof truss system but it is questionable that its attachment to the far side of the 1966 wing mitigates the wing's impact.

Mr. Larson asked for clarification of staff advice regarding removal of additions. Ms. Swallow explained that the owner presented two demolition schemes: one showed removal of all of the 1960s additions on the south side of the historic mill and one left one of the additions on the south side in place; both plans, however, included removal of the 1963 addition connecting the 1966 wing to the historic mill. She said that the owner removed all of the additions on the south side of the mill but left the 1963 connecting addition in place. She also clarified that despite lack of unanimity among staff, the recommendation is placement on the Study List with advice that the owners work closely with the HPO on their rehabilitation plans. She said that she understood that staff would continue to advocate for demolition of the 1963 connection to the 1966 wing.

Mrs. Barbee made a motion to defer a decision to the next meeting in order to have time to visit the site. The motion was not seconded. Mr. Larson asked what would happen if the 1966 wing were disconnected from the historic mill. Ms. Swallow replied that the wing would become a freestanding building that would remain part of the historic property as a noncontributing resource. Mr. Larson said that if the 1966 wing were freestanding, he would support nomination of the property, but he does not believe the NRAC can dictate further demolition to the owner; instead, he would support placement on the Study List with the recommendation that the owner consult closely with HPO staff. Mr. Black stated that placement on the Study List would encourage the owners to prepare a nomination that would be turned down if the property remains in its current state. Ms. Swallow informed the committee that the owners understand that a successful nomination is not guaranteed. Mr. Morrison said that he would vote to approve a

nomination if the 1963 connector were gone; if it remains, he could not vote for it. Mrs. Barbee asked Ms. McDonald for her opinion. Ms. McDonald said that she is ambivalent because she understands the National Register requirements as well as the viewpoint of the developers, and that it made sense to them to not follow through with all of the planned demolitions. She added that the committee's decision in 2011 was due in part to a misunderstanding about the architectural development of the historic mill, which has been illuminated with research done in the past year, and that additional research on the changing use of the building throughout the entire historic period could support eligibility under Criterion A for its importance to Morganton's industrial economy.

In the absence of a motion, Mr. Morrison called the question and asked for a show of hands from those in favor of placing the Dunavant Cotton Manufacturing Company on the Study List. All voted in favor of putting the property on the Study List except for Mr. Black, who voted against placement on the Study List.

Mr. Morrison thanked the committee and staff for their work and noted that the next NRAC meeting is scheduled for October 11, 2012. There being no further business, Mr. Morrison adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey J. Crow  
State Historic Preservation Officer

JJC/cb  
Attachments